REMARKS

Claims 1-41 are currently pending. All claims continue unamended. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,430,731 (hereinafter "Lee"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claim 1 recites the following features (emphasis added):

> selecting by a processor one of the plurality of timing events propagated to the input of the gate as a worst case timing event based at least in part upon a load data of the gate, an arrival time in the plurality of different arrival times and a slew in the plurality of different slews of the plurality of timing events.

Applicant respectfully submits that Lee fails to disclose each and every feature of the present claims in a manner as recited therein. For example, Lee does not select a timing event based at least in part upon a load data of the gate as claimed as clearly explained in the previous response dated June 2, 2009.

As stated in the previous response, Lee merely discloses a calculated representative signal. However, the calculated signal of Lee is not the same as the timing event selected as claimed because the signal of Lee is not based on any load data of the gate. The ***representative*** signal (s, a) of Lee is ***computed*** with the arrival time and slew according to equation (26). As clearly disclosed by Lee, Lee uses only slew (s) and arrival time (a) and not load data because Lee's equation only considers slew (s) and arrival time (a); therefore, Lee does not include any load data in the equation. Thus, Lee ***calculates*** a representative signal without considering the load data of the gate.

Moreover, mere mentioning of capacitance loading in Lee does not explicitly or implicitly disclose that the signal in Lee is calculated based on any load data as claimed. In fact, Lee clearly teaches away from the claims. As stated in column 4, lines 32-33 and 47-49 of Lee, Lee explicitly shows that it is not desirable to use capacitance loading in calculating the signal of Lee. Those lines disclose that it is not desirable to use load data because they are irrelevant to Lee's invention such as calculating the signal. As disclosed in Lee, for each input pin to output pin path inside a gate, the signal arrival time and slew at the output pin are functions of the signal

arrival time, slew at the input pin and other circuit parameters such as capacitance loading. The dependence on the other circuit parameters was dropped by Lee for clarity as it is irrelevant to an understanding of the present invention of Lee. Thus, Lee does not base anything on capacitance loading because, even though capacitance loading may be part of the slew and arrival time, Lee concluded that capacitanee loading information is irrelevant and not desirable in calculating the signal of Lee's invention. Thus, Lee teaches away from the claims by calculating the signal using only the signal arrival time and slew, and not the irrelevant other parameters such as load data.

Therefore, Lee merely discloses capacitance loading, but does not disclose or suggest using load data to calculate any signals. Lee does not use capacitance loading to calculate any signal at the gate output. Lee explicitly teach away from the claimed invention by disclosing calculating a signal without using capacitanee loading information as Lee believes that information to be irrelevant. This is further shown by the equations of Lee where load data is never part of those equations.

Thus, Lee does not disclose "selecting by a processor one of the plurality of timing events propagated to the input of the gate as a worst case timing event based at least in part upon a load data of the gate, an arrival time in the plurality of different arrival times and a slew in the plurality of different slews of the plurality of timing events" (emphasis added). For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the Lee reference.

For at least these same reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 6, 11, 19, 29 and 33 are likewise not anticipated by the cited references because they recite a limitation substantially similar to the limitation identified discussed with respect to claim 1 .

Since the remaining claims depend from these independent claims 1, 6, 11, 19, 29 and 33, respectively, these remaining dependent claims are also not anticipated and are therefore allowable over the cited references for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all claims are believed allowable, and an allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

To the extent that any arguments and disclaimers were presented to distinguish prior art, or for other reasons substantially related to patentability, during the prosecution of any and all parent and related application(s)/patent(s), Applicant(s) hereby explicitly retracts and rescinds any and all such arguments and disclaimers, and respectfully requests that the Examiner re-visit the prior art that such arguments and disclaimers were made to avoid.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Vista IP Law Group's Deposit Account No. 50-1105, referencing billing number 02PA053US01. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Vista IP Law Group's Deposit Account No. 50-1105, referencing billing number 02PA053US01.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 9, 2009

By: /Jasper Kwoh/
Jasper Kwoh
Registration No. 54,921
for
Peter C. Mei
Registration No. 39,768

Vista IP Law Group LLP
1885 Lundy Avenue,
Suite 108
San Jose, CA 95131
Telephone: (408) 321-8663